DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 218 JC 690 256

By-Partridge, Patrick V.

A Workshop for New Deans of Instruction with Little Background in the Junior College: An Analysis.

Pub Date 68

Note-38p.; Seminar paper

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.00

Descriptors-Administrative Personnel, *Administrator Responsibility, *Administrator Role, College Administration, *College Deans, *Junior Colleges

The objectives of this study were to: (1) explore the need for a workshop to clarify the role of the junior college dean of instruction, particularly for new deans with little or no prior junior college administrative experience; and (2) if such a workshop were needed, determine what content, methods and procedures, and prepared materials would be most beneficial. During the summer of 1968, letters requesting information relevant to the objectives stated above were sent to the chief administrators of 624 colleges having enrollments of at least 500 full-time students and to 52 officials representing state junior college agencies and associations. Responses indicated a workshop for new deans of instruction would be desirable. Suggestions relating to the content of the workshop included: an assessment of the problem of improving instruction; the need for more adequate guidelines to coordinate instructional programs and promote learning; workshop sessions should not take a "nuts and bolts" approach; lectures and visits to college facilities were not considered particularly functional; a combination of structured discussion, case, and in-basket items should be planned; and participants should provide in-basket items that reflect critical problems at their institution. Recommendations regarding the optimal time and length of the workshop as well as the inclusion of wives in the workshop were also solicited and received. (MB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 031210

A WORKSHOP FOR NEW DEANS OF INSTRUCTION WITH LITTLE BACKGROUND IN THE JUNIOR COLLEGE: AN ANALYSIS

For
Dr. B. Lamar Johnson

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of Education 470C

By
Patrick V. Partridge
1969 National Invitational Workshop

Fall Quarter 1968

JC 690 256

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 12 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	2
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	3
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE	9
IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	13
Order of Presentation of Data	13
What Problems or Issues Are, in Your Judgment, Most Difficult for a New Dean of Instruction?	14
What Topics or Problems Should be Considered at Such a Workshop?	16
What Suggestions Do You have Regarding Methods and Procedures?	18
Summary of Preprepared Materials Suggested for Assembly and Distribution	19
For What Period of Time Should the Workshop be Held	21
Should the Wives of New Deans be Invited to the Workshop?	22
Names of Deans of Instruction Recommended by Chief Administrator, State Agency and Association Officials	23
General Conclusions	26

Page

FOOTNOTES 27

BIBLIOGRAPHY 29

APPENDICES 31

APPENDIX I: Letter to Chief Administrator 32

APPENDIX II: Letter to State Official 35

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Inquiry and Reply of Chief Administrators	10
II	Inquiry and Reply of State Officers	12
III	What Problems or Issues Are, In Your Judgment, Most Difficult for the New Dean of Instruction?	15
IV	Suggested Topics for Consideration at a Workshop for New Junior College Deans of Instruction	17
V	Methods and Procedures for Suggested Workshop	19
VI	Summary of Pre-prepared Materials Suggested by Chief Administrators to be Assembled for Distribution	20
VII	For What Period of Time Should a Workshop be Held, i.e., Duration and Month?	21
VIII	Should the Wives of New Deans of Instruction Attend the Summer Workshop?	22
IX	State Directors Recommendations	24
X	New Deans Recommended by Chief Administrators	25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All respondants providing data for this study have pointed to the critical role of an Academic Dean as the internal spokesman for the junior college. Also noted by several junior college administrators was the relative paucity of data, empirical or otherwise, which might serve as guidelines for a new incumbent of the position. It is in acknowledgment of this phenomenon that the workshop coordinators are directing their efforts to an "in-depth" study of the multi-facet interactions of an academic dean.

With the above concerns serving as the caveat of a workshop design, several professionals in junior college education have been consulted to provide insight into the preparation and interpretation of findings from this study.

Those consulted were Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, Professor of Higher Education, UCLA; Dr. Stephen Sheldon, Director, Danforth Foundation Project; Dr. Arthur M. Cohen, Professor, UCLA; Dr. Don Morgan, Former President, Big Bend Community College, Washington; Dr. William Shawl, Dean of Instruction, Golden West College; Dr. Dudley Boyce, President, Golden West College; Mr. Richard L. Campion, President, Hollywood Junior College; Dr. Raymond E. Shultz, Professor, Florida State University at Tallahassee; Dr. Stuart R. Johnson, Director, 1969 Summer National Workshop.

The expertise provided by these leaders in the junior college movement has contributed appreciably in the formulation of recommendations to the workshop planning committee.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study grew out of concern for a greater understanding of the role of a junior college dean of instruction, especially as it relates to those individuals who have had little or no junior college administrative experience prior to assuming the position. Faced with burgeoning student populations, restricted state college and university enrollments*, increased public sensitivity regarding activist-militant behavior of students and faculty, an academic dean, and especially the novice, must become a "man for all seasons." It is recognized that excepting the various university-level "leadership programs," there is little in the way of formal preparation by which the dean can equip himself to meet the rigorous demands of his office. Considering the "press" upon his time and energies for matters related to just 'running the organization,' it is little wonder that concerns which are central to his role receive only peripheral attention.

If some means can be developed to provide strategies and techniques which will allow the academic dean to direct his efforts toward the objectives specified in the statement of junior college purposes, i.e., curriculum and instruction, the junior college movement can play a more effective part in American public education.

---

*Several California State Colleges have "frozen" enrollments to freshmen, sophomore and junior college 'transfer' students.

Statement of the Problem

From correspondence directed to Dr. B. Lamar Johnson by the participants in the 1968 "New Presidents" Junior College Workshop and Conference, came several requests for a workshop to be held for "new" junior college deans of instruction. It was then suggested by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson that a study be conducted to determine the feasibility of holding such a workshop and to determine the prerequisites of a workshop design.

Purposes of the Study

It is the purpose of this study to explore the views of junior college administrators throughout the United States 1) regarding the advisability of offering a workshop for deans of instruction who have had little or no junior college experience prior to assuming their position and 2) regarding their suggestions for such a workshop if it is held. Specifically explored will be the views of such administrators regarding, content, method and procedures, preprepared materials, advisability of inviting and conducting sessions for wives, and length and time of the workshop.

If a workshop is recommended and held, the information assembled in this study may be helpful in planning a workshop which will have a value for deans in creating an understanding of their roles--particularly, perhaps, in improving instruction.

Additionally, such a workshop experience may help prepare "new" deans for the National Conference planned for the week following--on a theme which is relevant to the role and responsibilities of the dean of instruction.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The junior college is operated for students. Learning is the primary function of the institution, and that learning must take place not only in the classroom, but in the extra-curricular activities and in all campus life. Learning implies teaching, and the basic objectives of junior college teaching are to prepare the student so that when he leaves the classroom he shall be educationally qualified to be a worker, a family person, a responsible citizen, one who can use and not waste leisure time, and a human soul touched with mystery and divinity.[1]

The junior college has four major functions according to Dolan:

1. Popularizing function--to give the advantages of college education of a general nature to secondary school graduates who could not otherwise secure it for geographical or economic reasons; and to give similar benefits to mature residents of the community.

2. Preparatory function--to give locally two years of work equivalent to that given in the freshman and sophomore years of standard universities, so that young people will be adequately prepared for upper division specialization at the university.

3. Terminal function--to give specific preparation by means of vocational courses for occupations on the semi-professional level, qualifying students who finish them for immediate places in specific life occupations; and to give general education for citizenship for all students who cannot continue their formal education beyond junior college.

4. Guidance function--to develop scientific interest in the individual traits and abilities and in the personal welfare of the student, in training him to think, in helping him to

> organize his studies efficiently, in making his college experience profitable to him to an optimum degree, and in assisting him to find his place after leaving the junior college, whether to a higher educational institution or in a life occupation.[2]

The most important function of the junior college is teaching. Traditionally, junior colleges have maintained that they provide superior instruction in their classrooms. Koos reported evidence about forty-five years ago to support this claim.[3]

Unlike the university, the junior college is not a research institution; neither is it an institution for training men and women of the "professions" though it may serve to develop other types of specialists. Its unique opportunity and obligation is to do a better job of teaching than that often provided in the lower division of many colleges and universities where there is a partition of interests. Junior college authorities agree that the junior college should be judged on the quality of teaching it does. So the quality of instruction is a real and intimate concern to junior college administrators, instructors, students and parents.[4]

Carpenter and Johnson found that almost all junior colleges, unless they are quite small, have an administrative officer called a dean. The precise nature of his duties and the extent of his responsibilities vary in the different types and sizes of junior colleges. Some junior colleges have an official taking care of the duties usually performed by the dean, but they prefer to give him another title. Whether it is a public or private junior college, the dean performs about the same duties. Carpenter and Johnson also discovered that there are more duties assigned to the public junior college dean than to the dean of a private institution. The size and type of organization have more to do with the assigned duties rather than whether the institution is public or private.[5]

Schiller Scroggs in a later study made a similar discovery in that

the dean's part in the improvement of college instruction is strongly conditioned by the nature and scope of his responsibilities, which are not standardized. The dean's status varies with the character of the president and the extent to which the latter confines himself to money raising, public relations, and other external matters. The traditions of the institution and especially the extent of faculty control play their part, as also does the character of the dean himself. The conviction persists that the dean can be a positive and effective factor in the improvement of college teaching.[6]

In a still later study, Leonard Haas found in the teacher's colleges of the nation that the function of a dean in a particular college is affected by such factors as the philosophy of education, the characteristics and qualities of the person concerned, and the number and type of other administrative officers on the campus.[7] An exact duplication of the functions of a dean from one college to another is as improbable as a duplication of the personalities involved. A perusal of the activities in which the deans engage run the gamut from tasks of a routine and mechanical nature to those requiring a high order of leadership. If, as Scroggs, implied, the president is concerned with the external matters of the college. Pierce states the view that the dean appears to be the leader in the internal operations of the institution. His work is to supervise all matters related to instruction and involving students at the college.[8]

The previous discussion has emphasized several over-all functions of the junior college actually revolving around "teaching ability" as the important quality junior college administrators want in a faculty. The academic dean of a junior college should increase the efficiency of instruction for he is generally given the responsibility of keeping instruction at a high quality. He should consider and discuss the significant and specific function of improving teaching and should arrive at individual judgments

based upon rational, comprehensive study of the best practices and opinions. His knowledge of the perceived functions of the junior college academic dean in the improvement of instruction let him advise both the faculty and the president regarding the quality of instruction performed at the college.

To help the academic dean himself and his institution in the coming years, Gould, in his 1964 study of The Academic Deanship, makes the following proposals:

> It would be profitable to make a close study of individual academic deans for the sake of describing and analyzing the totality of their decanal behavior in the context of instructional tradition, organization and interpersonal relationships. Such studies would serve to identify, among other things, the leadership techniques which these deans have proved most helpful.[9]

The design of a workshop format for new deans of instruction must address itself to those aspects of the dean's role most critical for the improvement of instruction. The 1962 Applachian conference for newly appointed junior college deans emphasized five major functions:

1. In cooperation with the faculty, he must determine appropriate courses, establish them, develop and evaluate them, and change them when necessary.

2. In his decision-making, he must balance conformity and anarchy and note the modern emphasis on man's responsibility for his own social evolution. In this role the best administrator releases and uses most fully the potential of his staff.

3. The dean must demonstrate his leadership behavior, as opposed to his innate capacity, to the president, the department heads, and the student leaders. He must run a productive and efficient organization, without neglecting consideration of others.

4. In encouraging faculty members to their best performance, he can (a) budget for all possible salary and fringe benefits, (b) remove work that can be done by non-certified staff, (c) provide adequate time for class preparation or private study, and (d) show appreciation, in many ways, of their true value as teachers.

5. The dean must use his influence in developing the students' sense of responsibility to those who show it. Student activities, counseling services, and the instructional program all contribute to this development.[10]

The dean's role exists at a time when many voices are declaiming "the system," considering it evil almost by definition. Some would say the system is obsolete--too much designed for exploitation and extractive purposes, responding little to the multisensory stimuli of our times and drawing little upon its own internal sources of energy to solve the problems the system creates. Above all these critics would say that those responsible for the system overlook the major sources of renewing energy--the students. A dean of instruction must think clearly and long about these condemnations because he is, in many ways prime engineer of the system as it operates in his community college. Using reference group theory, one must recognize that the dean takes his cues mainly from his president--and having received his job definition, the dean proceeds to involve himself with the faculty, the curricular processes and the institution-maintaining activities.

As John R. McKinley of Chabot College commented in his 1967 address delivered to the Kellogg Program Workshop at Stanford University:

> The role of the dean of instruction in a community college is a multi-splendored thing, reflecting the shades and hues of institutional characteristics and personality differences of the holder on the one hand and the existential forces and counterforces of the society in which the institution and the individual exist, on the other hand. To me, the role of dean is one of responsibility for active educational leadership whereby the dean becomes a serious and continuous student of the ends and means of higher education in a rapidly changing social order. He should take the initiative in the revision of educational policies and practices. He should have a vision of institutional purposes, participate actively in formulating an over-all plan for the development of the instiution and, as primus inter pares, should support the plan vigorously and persistently in academic councils. This is not the passive role which some would define for the dean where it is insitutional caretaker, arbiter-without-position over meeting of individuals with conflicting interests, or executive officer of the faculty Though the confusing and demanding daily routines and the complexity of curricular and; instructional decision-making, the dean must keep his eye on the student as the sole reason for the college's existence.[11]

It certainly seems reasonable in the light of the above information that we consider an organized approach to the study of the role of the dean of instruction. As the results of our data collection should point out, a workshop which can formulate some definitive strategies for the new dean to employ institution-wide, will be of immeasurable value to improving the quality of instruction throughout the junior college movement.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

During the summer of 1968, Dr. B. Lamar Johnson sent letters to the chief administrators of 624 junior colleges having enrollments of 500 or more full-time students, as listed in the 1968 Directory of the Association of American Junior Colleges.

The design of the letter permitted an open-end response to questions of a) whether in their judgment a workshop of the kind described would be desirable, b) suggestions for such a workshop if it is held, and c) asking for the names of new deans of instruction for whom such a workshop would be a valuable experience. Specific requests were made for suggestions regarding the content, procedures, pre-prepared materials, time and duration, an invitation to deans' wives--for the proposed workshop. (See Appendix I)

An initial list was compiled and a letter prepared which was mailed on August 30, 1968, to six hundred and twenty-four chief administrators of public junior colleges in 46 states, Puerto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone.

In addition, Dr. Johnson wrote a letter with similar purposes, which was mailed on September 30, 1968, to fifty-two officials representing state junior college agencies and associations. (See Appendix II)

TABLE I

Inquiry and Reply

STATE	CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS Letters sent as of (August 30, 1968)	REPLIES (By Dec. 6, 1968)
Alabama	11	2
Alaska	2	-
Arizona	6	1
Arkansas	3	2
California	81	37
Colorado	8	2
Connecticut	14	2
Delaware	3	1
District of Columbia	0	-
Florida	27	8
Georgia	11	3
Hawaii	3	2
Idaho	4	-
Illinois	39	17
Indiana	1	-
Iowa	20	2
Kansas	10	2
Kentucky	6	1
Louisiania	1	-
Maine	0	-
Maryland	10	4
Massachusetts	24	2
Michigan	25	3
Minnesota	13	8
Mississippi	17	-
Missouri	12	4
Montana	1	-
Nebraska	4	1
Nevada	0	-
New Hampshire	1	-
New Jersey	9	-
New Mexico	3	-
New York	42	5
North Carolina	30	9
North Dakota	3	1
Ohio	8	3
Oklahoma	9	3
Oregon	13	6
Pennsylvania	35	4
Rhode Island	3	2
South Dakota	0	-

TABLE I

Inquiry and Reply

STATE	CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS Letters sent as of (August 30, 1968)	REPLIES (By Dec. 6, 1968)
Tennessee	6	2
Texas	38	6
Utah	3	-
Vermont	3	-
Virginia	16	4
Washington	22	9
West Virginia	2	1
Wisconsin	14	-
Wyoming	2	2
Canal Zone	1	-
Puerto Rico	2	2
	624	Total 156

TABLE II

STATE DIRECTORS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES
Inquiry and Reply

STATE	STATE DIRECTORS (Letters sent as of Sept. 30, 1968)	REPLIES (By Nov. 6, 1968)
Alabama	1	1
Alaska	1	0
Arizona	1	1
Arkansas	1	1
California	2	0
Colorado	1	1
Connecticut	2	1
Delaware	2	1
Florida	1	0
Georgia	1	1
Hawaii	1	1
Idaho	1	1
Illinois	2	1
Indiana	1	0
Iowa	1	1
Kansas	1	1
Kentucky	1	1
Louisiania	1	0
Maine	1	0
Maryland	2	1
Massachusetts	1	1
Michigan	2	0
Minnesota	1	1
Mississippi	1	0
Missouri	1	0
Montana	1	1
Nebraska	1	0
Nevada	1	1
New Hampshire	2	2
New Jersey	1	1
New Mexico	1	1
New York	2	1
North Carolina	1	0
North Dakota	1	1
Ohio	1	0
Oklahoma	1	0
Oregon	1	0
Pennsylvania	2	1
Puerto Rico	2	0
Rhode Island	1	0
South Carolina	1	1
South Dakota	1	1
Tennessee	1	0
Texas	1	1
Utah	1	1
Vermont	1	0
Virginia	0	0
Washington	1	0
West Virginia	1	0
Wisconsin	1	1
Wyoming	1	0
Total	60	30

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Order of Presentation of Data

Based on the replies of our nation-wide survey of junior college officials and directors of state agencies and association, all respondents reacted positively, and oftimes enthusiastically, to the possibility of a workshop for new deans of instruction in the summer of 1969. As will be noted in Table I, 156 replies (25% of those written) were received from the chief college administrator by December 6, 1968. Table II indicates that 30 replies (50% of those written) were received from officials representing state agencies and associations.

Founded, then, on the indication of one-hundred percent support data for a workshop applicable to the following questions were presented:

> What problems or issues are, in your judgement, most difficult for a new dean of instruction?
>
> What topics or problems should be considered at such a workshop?
>
> What suggestions do you have regarding methods and procedures?
>
> Do you have in mind any types of materials which might to advantage be assembled--and in some instances perhaps specially prepared--prior to a workshop?
>
> For what period of time should be workshop be held, i.e., duration and month?
>
> Ought wives be invited to such a workshop?

Can you send me the name of a promising new dean of instruction for whom the workshop would be a desirable experience?

What Problems or Issues Are, In Your Judgment, Most Difficult for a New Dean of Instruction?

As Carson and Schultz pointed out in their comparative analysis of the junior college dean's leadership behavior: The leadership behavior of deans was frequently perceived by presidents differntly from the way it was perceived by student leaders. This discrepancy pointed to role conflicts for the deans. Both the student leaders and faculty expected more leadership qualities than they perceived in the deans, pointing to the need for greater communication between these groups.[12] From the results of the data, thus far, there seems to be a concensus regarding the leadership role of the dean for developing faculty participating in the improvement of instruction. You can observe by looking at the inquiry that an attempt was made to allow free response within the guidelines of particular questions. All respondents did not reply specifically to each question; therefore, in presenting the data throughout this study the positive responses have been combined into general categories.

Table III indicates a hierarchy of response, with the frequency of reference indicated for each general topic.

TABLE III

WHAT PROBLEMS OR ISSUES ARE, IN YOUR JUDGMENT, MOST DIFFICULT FOR A NEW DEAN OF INSTRUCTION?

	Area	Frequency
1.	Role of the dean of instruction for the improvement of teaching	75
2.	Role of the dean of instruction in developing participative decision-making among the faculty	70
3.	Encouragement of innovation in both teaching and administrative practices	62
4.	Role of the dean of instruction in developing the junior college as a 'unique' institution	60
5.	Role of the dean of instruction for channeling student energies and interests into the college's growth and development	60

A California junior college president confronted the issue directly by remarking:

> "I would like to suggest that a relatively small number of young, forward-looking, innovative deans of instruction be brought together in a free-wheeling atmosphere to address themselves to the question, 'How can we do a better job of causing students to learn?"

An Illinois administrator noted that "we are still in the horse and buggy days of putting 40 students in a class with a credentialed person and assuming that learning is taking place."

Most of the comments concerning the evaluation of faculty and instruction commended on the need for an "on-going evaluation program for <u>all</u> faculty members, rather than just for those who are of probationary status."

With reference to innovations in teaching, the comments of B. Lamar Johnson at the 1967 Stanford Seminar on the Experimental Junior College seem to sum up the feelings of the majority of colleges presidents:

> There is an increased interest in innovation and experimentation among Junior Colleges; experimentation and innovation are reported less frequently in vocational programs than in academic or general

education offerings, but there are special emphases on vocational education (including work-study programs) in some junior colleges with commitments to experimentation; experimental colleges both senior institutions and two-year colleges tend to be innovative rather than experimental institutions, and controlled experimentation and rigorous evaluation rarely are found in junior colleges which claim to be experimental.

The junior college, at times, is referred to as the most dynamic unit in American education. From the conference comes the suggestion that the two-year college become more dynamically experimental.

Throughout the urban centers of the United States, junior college administrators are especially concerned with students demands for a "black curriculum," a "brown curriculum," or "non-traditional experimental colleges."

What Topics or Problems Should be Considered at Such a Workshop?

On Table IV are indicated, in the order of their priority, the various topics suggested by the chief administrators as a basis for designing the formate for the new dean's workshop.

TABLE IV

SUGGESTED TOPICS FOR CONSIDERATION AT A WORKSHOP FOR NEW JUNIOR COLLEGE DEANS OF INSTRUCTION: CONTENT

	Suggestions	Response Frequency
	From Inquiry:	
1.	Improvement of instruction and its assessment	51
2.	Evaluation of faculty--rationale for retention, promotion, and dismissal	45
3.	Faculty-Dean relationships--development of leadership and decision-making roles within faculty	30
4.	Encouragement of innovation in teaching and administration	25
5.	Curriculum development--Evaluation and Improvement	22
6.	Role of the dean of instruction in improving teaching	20
7.	In-service education for administration and faculty	18
8.	Coordination of diverse functions of the junior college, e.g., transfer, vocational-technical, general and continuing education.	16
9.	Articulation with high school and four-year institutions	15
10.	Student activism and its utilization	14
11.	Administrative structural relationships	13
	Additional Topics Suggested:	
12.	Acquiring a perception of the junior college to view the institution "as a whole."	12
13.	Technical-Vocational programming, staffing and assessment in balance and coordination with general education curricula	10
14.	Development of a learning media center, use of computer-assisted instruction.	8
15.	Psychology of personnel policies and implementation	6
16.	Methods of "release time" from dean's routine duties	5
17.	Strategies of coordination for multi-campus and new college districts	4
18.	Strategies to develop a "unique" institution vis-a-vis public secondary schools and four year institutions	3
19.	Use of systems analysis re: staffing, curricula, long-range development and organizational priorities	2
20.	Development of sources for "critical" faculty staffing	1
21.	Development of effective remedial programs	1
22.	Strategies for community support of bond elections and tax-overrides; sources of additional revenue	1
23.	Budgeting and salary administration	1
24.	Relationship of dean to 'union-oriented' faculties	1
25.	Kinds of committee structure to meet college needs	1
26.	Relationship of dean to a Board who serves as an administrative vs a policy-making body.	1
27.	Preparation of accreditation reports and implementation of critique.	1
28.	Deans relation to adult and continuing education	1

Since our initial inquiry to the college administrators was 'open end,' giving the respondants an unlimited number of topical choices, it would be of no evaluative merit to compute the percentage of each item to the total. There was, however, a decided bias in favor of considering "teaching improvement" as a prerequisite to effective 'deanship.'

Interpretation of the data presented on Table IV might lead to the hasty conclusion that several of the topics are redundant. Upon careful appraisal, however, one can see that we are looking at aspects of a recurring theme; the coordination of a college's instructional program to produce learning.

The crucial task of the workshop planners will be to translate such abstract, and often ambiguous, concepts as "improvement of instruction," "evaluation of faculty," "faculty leadership," "encouragement of innovation," into viable strategies and techniques appropriate to the community college.

What Suggestions Do You Have Regarding Methods and Procedures?

Several respondents, who were in attendance at the 1968 workshop and conference on the junior college presidency, suggested that the workshop for new deans avoid lengthy presentations which do not give the participants opportunity to engage in meaningful dialogue.

Several presidents from the eastern seaboard and the west coast have called for workshop sessions to develop "sensitivity training" techniques of modern management, now employed so successfully by such corporations as TRW and IBM.

On Table V are ranked suggestions for methods and procedures to be considered in designing the format for a workshop.

TABLE V

METHODS AND PROCEDURES FOR SUGGESTED WORKSHOP

	From Inquiry	Frequency	Specific Negative Response
1.	Structured discussion - seminar	42	
2.	In-basket items	36	
3.	Case method	22	
4.	Visits to one or more junior college	11	8
5.	Game theory dynamics	9	
6.	Unstructured 'problem-solving' discussions	8	
7.	Lectures	3	5
8.	Social Occasions	1	
	Additional Suggestions		
9.	Consultants (brought in for specialized areas)	67	
10.	New deans submit in-basket items reflecting their own institution problem areas	32	
11.	Visits to campus sites with multi-media learning centers	12	

Summary of Preprepared Materials Suggested for Assembly and Distribution

Though a majority of college administrators did not suggest materials to be assembled for the new deans, a few thoughtful college presidents submitted manuscripts and materials reflecting their review and study of the dean of instruction's role:

"Genes for the Dean," a 1967 address by Stuart E. Marsee, President of El Camino College, California

"The College Teacher," position paper by Harold A. Hoeglund, Associate Dean of Southern Colorado State College

Report of the University System on Transfer of Credit, submitted by Harry S. Downs, Assistant ViceChancellor - Regents of the University System of Georgia

"The Role of the Dean of Instruction," a 1967 address by John R. McKinley of Chabot College - submitted by Dr. Don Morgan, former president of Big Bend Community College, Washington.

A frequent request for materials to be submitted was in the form of in-basket items, which would reflect the major issues of the attendant new dean's home institution. These items would give the workshop members an opportunity to analyze and review the impact of the dean's role over a national cross-section of American junior colleges; reflecting, perhaps a parochial interest in problems of urban colleges, multi-campus districts, shifting community occupational structure, etc.

Table VI indicates the various materials suggested by chief administrators.

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF PRE-PREPARED MATERIALS SUGGESTED BY THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS TO BE ASSEMBLED FOR DISTRIBUTION

	Materials	Frequency
1.	Organizational charts and job descriptions	22
2.	ERIC publications	10
3.	Case studies	10
4.	Load studies	8
5.	Schedule and catalog work sheets	6
6.	Professional bibliography, e.g., Mager, Bloom, Kerner Report, Cross	5
7.	Reprints of past articles from Junior College Journal	3
8.	Accreditation requirements	1
9.	Policies and procedural documents	1
10.	State and university transfer requirements	1
11.	Outlines or summaries of in-service programs	1
12.	Criteria for teacher hiring practices	1
13.	Booklets, brochures, and catalogs	1

For What Period of Time Should the Workshop be Held?

Preliminary planning sessions with the workshop Director, Dr. Stuart R. Johnson, and Dr. B. Lamar Johnson have suggested that the workshop might be held for one week--with the National Conference immediately following. The feeling is prompted by reflecting on the enthusiastic letters of commendation for the 1968 workshop for new presidents; a suggestion that workshop sessions should not be scheduled during the national conference, but be timed to coincide with the conference--giving workshop members an opportunity to participate fully in both.

On Table VII is presented the frequency response of suggestions for the duration of the workshop.

TABLE VII

FOR WHAT PERIOD OF TIME SHOULD A WORKSHOP BE HELD
i.e., DURATION AND MONTH?

Duration	Frequency
One week	72
Three days to one week	12
Maximum of two weeks	8
Two weeks (minimum)	4

All chief administrators responding indicated July as the most appropriate month

Should the Wives of New Deans be Invited to the Workshop?

An interesting phonomenon seems to be operating here. Whereas the new presidents overwhelmingly requested the attendance of their wives at the workshop, there was a significant negative response regarding a similar prospect for the new deans. Several of the junior college presidents indicated that the role of the dean's wife did not have sufficient relevance to the functions of the position to warrant special sessions conducted in her behalf. The opinions expressed suggested that "emotional support" was the best prerequisite for an effective role behavior by the dean's wife. The question arises, however, regarding the necessary skills assumed by the wife of a dean when, or if, he makes the transition to a college presidency.

TABLE VIII

SHOULD THE WIVES OF NEW DEANS OF INSTRUCTION ATTEND THE SUMMER WORKSHOP?

	Frequency	Specific Negative Response
1. Ought wives be invited to such a workshop?	42	39
2. Would it be desirable to have separate sessions for wives?	4	
3. Would a combination of separate and joint sessions for wives and deans be desirable?	2	

Names of Deans of Instruction Recommended by Chief Administrator, State Agency, and Association Officials

In order to give careful consideration to the extensive number of deans recommended for participation in the 1969 Invitational Workshop Table IX and Table X have omitted the names of the 71 academic deans and 11 state officers submitted for consideration.

The final selection process will probably see thirty to forty deans invited to attend the workshop, with a hope that they will also wish to participate in the national conference directly following.

To effectively accommodate the greater number of attendant administrators, when compared to the 25 new presidents attending the 1968 workshop, a tentative decision was reached to exclude wives of deans from active participation at the workshop.

TABLE IX

STATE DIRECTORS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Inquiry and Reply

STATE	RECOMMENDED DEANS (By Dec. 6, 1968)	RECOMMENDED STATE OFFICIALS (By Dec. 6, 1968)
Alabama	0	1
Alaska	0	0
Arizona	10	0
Arkansas	2	0
California	0	0
Colorado	4	0
Connecticut	3	0
Delaware	2	0
Florida	0	0
Georgia	4	0
Hawaii	2	1
Idaho	1	0
Illinois	0	0
Indiana	0	0
Iowa	3	1
Kansas	8	0
Kentucky	4	1
Louisiana	0	0
Maine	0	0
Maryland	1	0
Massachusetts	6	0
Michigan	0	0
Minnesota	1	0
Mississippi	0	0
Missouri	0	0
Montana	2	0
Nebraska	0	0
Nevada	1	1
New Hampshire	1	0
New Jersey	3	1
New Mexico	1	0
New York	0	0
North Carolina	0	0
North Dakota	3	1
Ohio	0	0
Oklahoma	0	0
Oregon	0	0
Pennsylvania	5	0
Puerto Rico	0	0
Rhode Island	0	0
South Carolina	0	3
South Dakota	0	0
Tennessee	0	0
Texas	10	0
Utah	1	0
Vermont	0	0
Virginia	0	0
Washington	0	0
West Virginia	0	0
Wisconsin	2	1
Wyoming	0	0
Total	80	11

TABLE X

STATE-BY-STATE BREAKDOWN OF THE NUMBERS OF NEW DEANS RECOMMENDED BY THEIR CHIEF ADMINISTRATORS

State	Recommendations (Names withheld)
Alabama	2
Alaska	0
Arizona	3
Arkansas	0
California	12
Colorado	1
Connecticut	1
Delaware	0
District of Columbia	0
Florida	2
Georgia	0
Hawaii	2
Idaho	0
Illinois	7
Indiana	0
Iowa	0
Kansas	1
Kentucky	0
Louisiana	0
Maine	0
Maryland	1
Massachusetts	0
Michigan	3
Minnesota	6
Mississippi	0
Missouri	1
Montana	0
Nebraska	1
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	0
New Jersey	0
New Mexico	0
New York	2
North Carolina	6
North Dakota	0
Ohio	0
Oklahoma	2
Oregon	2
Pennsylvania	2
Rhode Island	2
South Dakota	0
Tennessee	2
Texas	2
Utah	0
Vermont	0
Virginia	4
Washington	3
West Virginia	0
Wisconsin	0
Wyoming	1
Canal Zone	0
Puerto Rico	0
Total	71

General Conclusions

Considering the background information in this study calling for an 'in-depth' analysis of the academic dean, coupled with some insightful comments from junior college presidents throughout the country, the following conclusions, drawn from the data presented, seem evident:

1. A workshop for recently appointed junior college deans of instruction with little background in the junior college would be desirable.

2. The role of the dean in the improvement of instruction is the critical problem which many chief administrators felt most significant for the new dean.

3. There are, at present, few guidelines which are available for the new dean in carrying out the increasingly complex tasks of coordinating the instructional program to "produce student learning."

4. In order to design a workshop which will be 'relevant' to the issues faced by contemporary academic deans, it seems advisable to eschew a "nuts and bolts" approach to the workshop sessions. Such problems as proper "class scheduling," "faculty office allotment," "agenda for faculty meetings," "types of committee structure," seem to have low priority.

5. In the planning of such a workshop, lectures and visits to college facilities are not particularly functional.

6. A combination of structured discussion, case and in-basket items should be planned.

7. Participants in the workshop should provide in-basket items which reflect critical problems at their institution.

8. Wives should <u>not</u> be invited to attend the workshop sessions.

9. A workshop of one week during the month of July would be most appropriate when considering the deans; heavy schedules.

FOOTNOTES

1. Hugh G. Price, "The Role of the Administration in Excellent Teaching," Junior College Journal, XXIX September, 1953, p. 42

2. F. H. Dolan, "The Preparation of Junior College Teachers," Junior College Journal, XXIX February, 1952, p. 329

3. Leonard V. Koos, The Junior College, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924, pp. 214-32

4. H. T. Morse, "Improving Instruction in the College Classroom," Junior College Journal, XXV May, 1955, p. 513-14

5. W. W. Carpenter and J. R. Johnson, "The Junior College Dean," Junior College Journal, XXII September, 1942, p. 19

6. Schiller Scroggs, "The Deans Part in the Improvement of Instruction," College and University, XXVI January, 1951, p. 199

7. Leonard Haas, "The Academic Dean in American Teachers Colleges," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLII March, 1956, p. 137

8. A. C. Peirce, "Deans in the Organization of Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, XXII February, 1951, p. 366

9. John W. Gould, The Academic Deanship, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1964, p. 101

10. Proceedings of the Conference for Newly Appointed Junior College Deans of Instruction, Applachian State College, Boone, North Carolina, August 6-10, 1962

11. John R. McKinley, "The Role of the Dean of Instruction," An address delivered to the Kellogg Program Workshop, Stanford Univerisity, July 11, 1967

12. J. O. Carson and Raymond E. Schultz, "A Comparative Analysis of the Junior College Dean's Leadership Behavior," Journal of Experimental Education, XXXII Summer 1964, pp. 355-362

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Blocker, Clyde E., Plummer, Robert H., and Richardson, Robert C., Jr. The Two-Year College: Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc, 1965

Bogue, Jesse P. The Community College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.

Clark, Burton R. The Open Door College. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1960.

Dibden, Arthur J. E. The Academic Deanship in American Colleges and Universities. Southern Illinois University Press, Feffer & Simons, Inc., 1968.

Dodds, Harold W. The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process," Administrative Theory in Education, Andrew W. Halpin, ed., Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1958.

Gibb, Cecil A. "Leadership," Handbook of Social Psychology. Gardner Lindzey, ed., Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.

Gould, John W. The Academic Deanship. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1964.

McConnell, T. R. "Needed Research in College and University Organization and Administration," The Study of Academic Administration. Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

Medsker, Leland L. The Junior College: Progress and Prospect. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1960.

Milner, Clyde A. The Dean of the Small College. Boston: The Christopher Publishing House, 1936.

Robb, Felix C. The Deanship of the Liberal Arts College. Nashville, Tennessee: The Methodist Church Board of Education, 1962.

Thornton, James W., Jr. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1960.

APPENDIX I

Letter from Dr. B. Lamar Johnson to the Chief Administrator of a Junior College

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO · SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

TO THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR:

We at UCLA have just completed a workshop for new junior college presidents (and their wives) who have had little or no junior college experience prior to becoming chief administrators. Among the suggestions reflecting the response to this program was a request for a similar workshop to be held--probably in the summer of 1969--for new junior college Deans of Instruction. In addition to the workshop (which would probably be limited to 25 deans and their wives) our 1969 Summer National Junior College Conference will in all likelihood have as its theme, "The Junior College Dean of Instruction."

My purpose in writing this letter is to ask whether in your judgment it would be desirable to hold such a workshop and conference, and, if so, to solicit your suggestions for them. Rather than sending you a questionnaire to which you might respond, I am expressing the hope that you may be willing to write me a letter on such matters as those listed below. (Please do not feel that it is incumbent upon you to respond to all of the questions; also do not feel limited by them.) I will also be pleased to know of the names of any new deans of instruction for whom such a workshop would be a valuable experience and who give promise of being outstanding leaders in junior college administration.

Content: What problems or issues are, in your judgment, most difficult for a new dean of instruction? What topics or problems--in such areas, for example, as the role of the dean of instruction; evaluation of faculty; improving instruction; student activism; curriculum development; in-service education; articulation with high schools and four-year institutions; encouragement of innovation in teaching; coordination of such diverse functions as transfer, general education, technical-vocational, continuing education; administrative structure; and faculty relationships--should be considered at a workshop?

Method and procedures: What suggestions do you have regarding methods and procedures (for example, use of case method, use of "in-basket" items of the type that come to the desk of a dean of instruction, unstructured discussion, structured discussion, lectures, visits to one or more junior colleges, social occasions) for use at a workshop?

Pre-prepared materials: Do you have in mind any types of materials which might to advantage be assembled--and in some instances perhaps specially prepared--prior to a workshop?

Wives: Ought wives be invited to such a workshop? If so, would it be desirable to have separate sessions for wives? Would a combination of some separate sessions for wives and some joint sessions for deans of instruction and wives be desirable? What problem or issue has, in your judgment, proved to be most difficult for wives of new deans of instruction?

Length of workshop: The suggestion has been made that the workshop should be held for a period of one week. Do you have any comments on this suggestion?

Names of deans of instruction: Can you send me the name of a promising new dean of instruction for whom the workshop would be a desirable experience? Please comment regarding the likely value of a workshop for him, his likely contribution to a workshop, and his potential for future administrative leadership. I will particularly welcome receiving the names of deans with little or no junior college experience--though you need not limit your suggestions to such administrators.

Other suggestions: Do you have any other suggestions regarding the proposed workshop and conference?

This is, I fear, an overlong letter. I have, however, felt the necessity of writing at some length in order to indicate the scope of our present thinking and planning.

You may be sure I will look forward to hearing from you and that I will be most grateful for any suggestions you may be willing to make.

Sincerely,

B. Lamar Johnson
Professor of Higher Education

BLJ:vh

APPENDIX II

Letter from Dr. B. Lamar Johnson to the
Official representing a State Agency or Association

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

BERKELEY · DAVIS · IRVINE · LOS ANGELES · RIVERSIDE · SAN DIEGO · SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA · SANTA CRUZ

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

Date

Dear

This past summer we at UCLA held a workshop for new junior college presidents (and their wives) who had little or no junior college experience prior to becoming chief administrators. During and subsequent to the workshop, I have been impressed by suggestions for a similar workshop to be held in the summer of 1969--for new junior college deans of instruction. In addition to the workshop, our 1969 Summer National Junior College Conference will in all likelihood have as its theme a topic related to the role and responsibility of the dean of instruction.

My purpose in writing this letter is to ask whether you can send me the names of deans of instruction--appointed within the past three years--or those members of your own staff bearing a state-wide responsibility in the area of instruction, who came to their positions without experience in junior college education, or who had relatively meager backgrounds in the junior college. In addition, I will appreciate your recommendations of any dean or instructional officer for whom you believe a workshop would be particularly valuable.

I will also be most pleased to receive any suggestions you may have for such a workshop, including topics to be considered or procedures to be followed.

It is my intention to correspond with a number of deans of instruction--in an attempt to identify some of the problems which confront them in their positions. Due to the overwhelming support for our proposed workshop, we are already in the planning stages of what promises to be a significant experience for those who attend.

You may be sure that I appreciate your trouble in this matter.

My best wishes.

Cordially yours,

B. Lamar Johnson
Professor of Higher Education

P.S. I recognize, of course, that you may not know of any deans of instruction of the type which I am seeking to identify.